

## **ORDER REVIEWING SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES SUBMITTED TO THE EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE JOURNAL**

### 1. Organization and procedure of reviewing

1.1. The article is accepted for consideration only on condition that it meets the requirements for the original author's articles (materials) posted on the journal's website.

1.2. All articles submitted to the editorial board are subject to review. Articles are not published in the journal without peer review. The scientific publication reviews all materials submitted to the editorial office that correspond to its subject matter in order to assess them. All reviewers are recognized experts. The reviews are kept in the publishing house and in the editorial office of the peer-reviewed scientific publication for five years.

1.3. The article is sent for review to a member of the editorial board of the journal.

1.4. The review of manuscripts is carried out confidentially in order to protect the rights of the author. The editorial board has adopted the format of double

-blind peer review.

1.5. All author's manuscripts are checked for compliance with the journal's subject matter, design requirements, uniqueness and the absence of incorrect borrowings, including self-borrowings.

1.6. All materials submitted to the editorial office undergo mandatory electronic (software) verification for incorrect borrowings and excessive self-citation before sending the manuscripts to reviewers. In the absence of an expert reviewer in the appropriate direction, the editorial board undertakes to invite an external independent specialist.

1.7. The reviewer evaluates the compliance of the article with the scientific profile of the journal, its relevance, novelty, theoretical and (or) practical significance, the presence of conclusions and recommendations, compliance with the established rules of registration.

1.8. Based on the review, a decision is made and communicated to the author: to accept the manuscript for publication; return for revision: comments, recommendations and deadlines are brought to the attention of the author; refusal to publish: a reasoned refusal is sent to the author.

The editorial board of the reviewed scientific publication sends the authors of the submitted materials copies of the reviews and/or a reasoned refusal, and also undertakes to send copies of the reviews to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation upon receipt of the corresponding request to the editorial board of the reviewed scientific publication. The terms of reviewing

articles are determined by the editor-in-chief of the journal, taking into account the conditions for the most prompt response to the author of the publication and are no more than 30 working days from the date of their receipt by the reviewer. The editorial board may deny the reviewer the right to review.

1.9. An article accepted for publication, but in need of revision, is sent to the author with appropriate comments from the reviewer and/or the editor-in-chief. The author must make all necessary corrections to the final version of the manuscript and submit it to the editorial office on electronic media. After revision, the article is re-reviewed, and the editorial board decides on the possibility of publication. Articles sent to the authors for correction must be returned to the editorial office within the time limit set by the editorial board. If the article is returned at a later date, the date of its publication may be changed.

1.10. Upon receipt of a positive review, the editorial board informs the author about the admission of the article for publication.

1.11. Reviewers are not allowed to make copies of manuscripts for their own needs and are prohibited from giving part of the manuscript to another person for review without the permission of the editorial board. Reviewers, as well as editorial staff, do not have the right to use information about the content of the work before its publication in their own interests. The manuscripts are the intellectual property of the authors and relate to information that is not subject to disclosure.

1.12. In case of receiving a negative review, the author may require the editorial board to send the article for review to another reviewer. The editorial board has the right to refuse or agree to the author's request. If the article receives a negative expert assessment from the second reviewer, it is definitively rejected.

## 2. Requirements for the content of the review

2.1. The review must contain a qualified analysis of the manuscript material, its objective reasoned assessment and a reasonable conclusion about the publication.

2.2. In the review, special attention should be paid to highlighting the following issues:

- general analysis of the scientific level, relevance of the topic, structure of the article, terminology;
- assessment of the compliance of the design of the article materials with the established requirements: the volume of the article as a whole and its individual elements (text, tables, illustrative material, bibliographic references); the expediency of placing tables, illustrative material in the article and their compliance with the stated topic;

- scientific presentation, compliance of the methods, techniques, recommendations and research results used by the author with modern achievements of science and practice;
- reliability of the stated facts, reasonableness of hypotheses, conclusions and generalizations;
- scientific novelty and significance of the material presented in the article;
- inaccuracies and mistakes made by the author;
- recommendations on the rational reduction of the volume or necessary additions to the materials proposed for publication explaining the essence of the presented research results (specify for which element of the article);
- conclusion about the possibility of publication.

2.3. The review must be signed by the reviewer.

At the request of the reviewer, reviews can be written in free form in compliance with the requirements of clause 2.2 of this Regulation.

### 3. The rules of

retraction 3.1. Possible grounds for retraction of the article:

- Duplication of an article in several publications; detection of incorrect borrowing or significant self-citation (self-plagiarism).
- An open violation of the points of the author's publication ethics.

Identification of facts of falsification or fabrication, as well as the detection of significant errors that cast doubt on the scientific value of the article. In this case, the error may be the result of both conscientious error and deliberate violations by the authors of publications.

3.2. A notification is sent to the author(s) of the retracted article indicating the grounds for retraction.

3.3. There is no limitation period for the retraction procedure.

### 4. Data retention policy

The archive of issues of the journal is available for review and download

4.1. On the official website of the journal <https://vestnikniiran.ru/vyipuski> 4.2. In the scientific electronic library e-library

This Procedure for reviewing manuscripts of articles was developed on the basis of Order No. 534 of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation dated 05/31/2023 "On Approval of the Rules for Forming a list of peer-reviewed scientific publications in which the main scientific results of dissertations for the degree of Candidate of Sciences, for the degree of Doctor of Sciences, and requirements for peer-reviewed scientific publications for inclusion in the list of peer-reviewed scientific publications, in which the main scientific results of dissertations for the degree of Candidate of Sciences, for the degree of Doctor of Sciences should be published"